

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1 50 www.uspto.gov

PAPER NUMBER

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRM TION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 12/05/2003 Flow-thru.CIP 10/728,725 John A. Navis **EXAMINER** 06/17/2004 7590 HOOK, JAMES F DAVID G. HENRY

7th Floor 900 Washington Avenue P.O. Box 1470 Waco, TX 77603-1470

3752 DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

ART UNIT

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/728,725	NAVIS, JOHN A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
TI- MAIL INC DATE CHI	James F. Hook	3752
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to the second period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by second period for reply will, by second patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re, n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	······································	
•	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the continuous The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand orrection is required if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). a) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Ap priority documents have been i ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Si Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)	Immary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/728,725

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Application/Control Number: 10/728,725

Art Unit: 3752

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract only sets forth benefits of the article and not structure of the article itself as required above. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "said extended portion" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said transition portion" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,659,134.

Art Unit: 3752

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the language of claim 1 is encompassed by that set forth in the '134 patent where one skilled in the art would have found it obvious that the structure described in claim 1 is the same as that set forth in the '134 patent just phrased differently, where there appears to be no structure that would deviate from that set forth by the broader terminology of claim 1 in the '134 patent.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Winder, Hechler, IV., Hattler, Herbulot, Cameron, Jeppsson, St. Goar, Ash (953 and 699), and Maginot disclosing state of the art multi lumen tubes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James F. Hook whose telephone number is (703) 308-2913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday, work at home Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mar can be reached on (703) 308-2087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/728,725 Page 5

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James F. Hook Primary Examiner Art Unit 3752

JFH